



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## CRITICAL STUDIES OF PATRISTIC TEXTS

Beeson's addition to the Prussian Academy's series of Greek Christian writers is worthy of its sponsor.<sup>1</sup> It is, to be sure, not in Greek though it contains such fragments of the Greek as are preserved in other writings. As in the case of many other writings one is too thankful that it is preserved in any form to complain that it exists only in translation. In the case of this primary source for the history of Manichaeism we have double ground for gratitude in this edition, in that the version, hitherto incomplete, is, thanks to a discovery by Traube and the use of this by Beeson, now at our disposition in complete and carefully edited form. The well-edited text and its various readings fill one hundred pages, and introduction and indices nearly as many more. The indices are useful and adequate, and are four in number—to Bible references, names, Greek words, and Latin words. The introduction gives literary references to the *Acta*, discusses the author and language of the original, the Latin translation, the manuscripts, and their relationships, the transmission, and the editions.

The editor concludes that the original was doubtless by Hegemonius and in Greek. He considers that there is little ground for thinking that Jerome was right in supposing a Syriac original, although Hegemonius doubtless used older sources. Whether the work was written in Egypt, Syria, or Asia Minor, and whether in the first or second quarter of the fourth century, is still unsettled. The Latin translation was made about the year 400 in Rome. The half-dozen manuscripts, of which only the twelfth-century manuscript of Traube is complete and the Monte Cassino manuscript of about the same period even approximately complete, are treated with great fulness of paleographic detail. The relation of the manuscripts is treated with equal detail and wealth of various readings. The editor has an admirable foundation for his evidences of relationship in the considerable Greek fragments from Epiphanius.

This work by an American editor exhibits all the characteristic excellences of German scholarship and a few of its faults, as well as one variation significant of a hope that American scholarship may survive in the world-wide struggle for existence among types of scholarship. It has the painstaking accuracy in detail, the piling of proof on proof, the refined method of displaying the textual evidence in the footnotes and, characteristic of the

<sup>1</sup> *Hegemonius Acta Archelai*. Herausgegeben in Auflage der Kirchenvater-Commission der königl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Von Charles Henry Beeson. (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte. Bd. 16.) Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1906. lvi + 133 pages.

very latest phase, a shyness and apologetic attitude in the use of graphic representations for fear of seeming to claim too great conclusiveness.

It may be that the method verges a little at times on fault in piling up proofs in the matter of various readings, where a few well-chosen ones would be quite as well adapted artistically to produce conviction. The same thing may be said of the full paleographic detail as to manuscripts which is above the strictly proportionate need for an edition and thus artistically superfluous. Such products of American scholarship as this work are not so wholly exceptional as they were twenty years ago, but those of this quality are still very rare.

Anything by Dombart on St. Augustine<sup>2</sup> one might expect to have value and interest; and this little tract on a very special subdivision of the text-history of the *De Civitate Dei* does not disappoint expectation as to its value, within its limitations, while to its limited but real interest in itself is added the very human fact that the distinguished author devoted his last energies to this work and died while the book was in press. The work is simply a discussion of the earliest printed editions but the discussion is conducted by very thorough comparison of the editions with one another on the basis of their variations from one another and from the manuscripts, and the conclusions reached are convincing. Dombart discusses chiefly the Sweynheim-Pannartz editions of Subiaco, 1467, Rome, 1468 and 1470, the Vindelinius editions of Venice, 1470, 1475, 1486, the Schöffer edition, Mainz, 1473, and the Mentelin edition, Strassburg, 1468.

He shows that the Sweynheim-Pannartz editions and the Mentelin edition are quite independent of one another, that the Vendelinus Venice editions are taken directly from the Sweynheim-Pannartz, that the Schöffer (Mainz, 1473) is chiefly from Mentelin's but partly also from the Sweynheim-Pannartz. The Wenssler edition (Basel, 1479) is copied directly from the Schöffer edition, 1473, and Amerbach's editions of 1489 and 1490 are a mixture of the *princeps* and Schöffer.

He further finds that the Sweynheim-Pannartz editions are taken from the Padua manuscript No. 1490, once owned by Petrarch, and that the Mentelin (Strassburg, 1468) edition is from an older manuscript, of the same group, as it happens, though not even this is one of the oldest or best. Incidentally the study confirms the result of Proctor and others placing the Mentelin edition before that of Schöffer and carrying it back so far as almost to dispute the claim of the Subiaco edition to being the *princeps*.

<sup>2</sup> *Zur textgeschichte der "Civitas Dei" Augustins seit dem Entsteher der ersten Druche.* Von Bernh. Dombart. (*Texte u. Untersuchungen*, XXXII, 2a.) Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908. 56 pages. M. 2.

Dombart concludes that in spite of the definite progress made on the text during the past centuries there is still plenty of work to be done especially in the matter of the order of the words and orthography.

ERNEST CUSHING RICHARDSON

PRINCETON, N. J.

The fourth volume of the Prussian Academy's *Eusebius* contains the works *Against Marcellus* and *On Ecclesiastical Theology*.<sup>3</sup> For the authenticity of these as genuine works of Eusebius of Caesarea, Klostermann briefly contends, against the views of Conybeare. The seven manuscripts are reducible to one, the Venice Codex Marcianus 496, of the tenth century, from which all the others are derived. The text was first published by Richard Montagu, in 1628, unfortunately from one of the later manuscripts. Gaisford's edition of 1852, on the other hand, was almost wholly based on the Venice manuscript. Nolte published the text in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. XXIV, in 1857, but made no use of that most important manuscript. Klostermann bases his text on the Venice manuscript which he has himself examined. His apparatus of variant readings is naturally very limited. The Greek text of the two books *Against Marcellus* is followed by that of the three books *On Ecclesiastical Theology*, and this in turn by a collection of the fragments of the writings of Marcellus, gleaned from the books *Against Marcellus* and to a limited extent from the pages of Epiphanius. A full set of indices completes the work, which bids fair to stand as the definitive edition of these two minor works of Eusebius.

Armenian Bibles of the twelfth and earlier centuries are without the Revelation of John, which about 1198 A. D. found its way into the Armenian New Testament through the agency of Nerses, bishop of Tarsus. His recension was based upon an earlier Armenian version of the Apocalypse, which he corrected with the aid of a Greek text. This earlier version<sup>4</sup> is here printed by Mr. Conybeare, who bases his edition chiefly upon a Bodleian manuscript of the fourteenth century. The translation of this text is accompanied by select variants, given in English, for the lay reader. After a detailed discussion of the evidence, the editor concludes that the

<sup>3</sup> *Eusebius*. Vierter Bd. (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte.) Herausgegeben von Erich Klostermann. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1906. xxx+256 pages. M. 9.

<sup>4</sup> *The Armenian Version of Revelation and Cyril of Alexandria's Scholia on the Incarnation and Epistle on Easter*. Edited by Fred C. Conybeare, from the oldest manuscripts and English ed. London: The Text and Translation Society, 1907. 220+189 pages. 21s.

version was made early in the fifth, or even in the fourth, century, probably from an Old Latin copy. The Scholia of Cyril of Alexandria on the Incarnation are also included in this volume, in Armenian (once before published, 1711) with an English translation.

The lack of both index and table of contents greatly impairs the usefulness of this book, and subjects all who use it to no little annoyance, especially by reason of the intricate arrangement of its varied contents.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

### THE TEACHING OF NESTORIUS IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT RESEARCH

That Nestorius was condemned for political and personal reasons and not on account of his heretical opinions has for some time been the judgment of church historians. This conclusion, based upon the results of the study of the uncritical and inadequate collections of his literary remains is placed beyond question by the work of the two men whose books are the subject of this review. While making a fresh study of Nestorius for the fourth edition of his well-known *Dogmengeschichte*, Professor Loofs was impressed with the great need of a critical edition of the writings of Nestorius that have come down to us. In his *Nestoriana*<sup>1</sup> he offers us a first attempt from the point of view of modern scholarship at a critical reconstruction of the text, the work of Garnier in the seventeenth century in no sense satisfying the conditions of a modern edition of the text. Those at all familiar with the cautious and exacting scholarship of Professor Loofs will not be deceived by the modesty of the man in offering this work as tentative, and inviting the criticism and co-operation of scholars in this field to carry it on to a more satisfactory text, but will accept and use the work with the greatest confidence.

Aside from the Syriac version of the *Bazaar of Heracleides* which came to light too recently to be used by Loofs, although he is acquainted with its general contents, no single sermon, letter, or treatise of Nestorius has come down to us except in the form of quotations in the writings of his opponents or under the protection of some more orthodox writer. Loofs himself has been fortunate enough to discover a sermon of Nestorius, the only one preserved intact, in a volume of sermons of St. Chrysostom. Hai-

<sup>1</sup> *Nestoriana*—Die Fragmente des Nestorius gesammelt, untersucht und herausgegeben von Dr. Friedrich Loofs, mit Beiträgen von Stanley A. Cook, M.A., und Dr. Georg Kampffmeyer. Halle: Niemeyer, 1905. 407 pages. M. 15.